DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 471 545 TM 034 647

AUTHOR	Lindsey, Jimmy; Ghose, Chhanda; Patterson, Regina; Anzelmo-Skelton, Nicki L.; van der Jagt, Johan; Woods, Carolyn F.
TITLE	Certification in Mild Disabilities: Perceptions and Preferences of Louisiana Special Education Professionals and Students.
PUB DATE	2002-11-00
NOTE	40p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Mid-South Educational Research Association (Chattanooga, TN, November 6-8, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Certification; *College Students; Ethnicity; Higher Education; *Mild Disabilities; Racial Differences; Sex Differences; Special Education; *Special Education Teachers

ABSTRACT

This study determined the mild disabilities certification perceptions and preferences of Louisiana special education (SPED) professionals and students. A stratified random sampling procedure was used to select the subjects, who included 115 undergraduates and 44 graduate students, 26 professors, 24 local or school system directors of SPED, and 22 state department SPED administrators (total population 576). Between-subjects designs were used, with factors being status/position, gender, ethnicity, disability status, and knowledge of Louisiana type of mild disabilities certification. The dependent variables were the subjects' categorical certification perceptual scores for students with mild disabilities (learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, mental disabilities) by programming areas (assessment, behavior development/management, instruction, collaboration, and school-home cooperation) and preferences for categorical or multicategorical/generic certification under three assumed roles (Louisiana SPED director, SPED teacher, parent of a child with mild disabilities). Statistical Package for the Social Sciences 11 descriptive, analysis of variance, Krushal-Wallis H Test, Mann-Whitney U test, and chi square statistics were used for data analysis (alpha level $p<.01$). Findings suggest that status/position and disability status affected subjects' mild disabilities certification perceptual scores for specific educational programming areas and students with mild disabilities (e.g., undergraduates and subjects with a disability had higher categorical scores). Subjects also had different preferences for mild disabilities certification under selected assumed roles (e.g., Louisiana director of SPD and special-education setting; professors and subjects with a disability preferred categorical certification). Significant and nonsignificant results were presented and discussed. The findings of this study will add to the SPED literature and can be used by SPED policy makers addressing certification for teachers of mild disabilities. (Contains 9 tables and 18 references.) (Author/SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 471 545

Certification in Mild Disabilities: Perceptions and Preferences of Louisiana Special Education Professionals and Students

A Research Paper

by

Jimmy D. Lindsey, Chhanda Ghose, and Regina Patterson (Southern University - Baton Rouge), Nicki L. Anzelmo-Skelton and Johan van der Jagt (Southeastern Louisiana University), and Carolyn F. Woods (Baton Rouge, LA)

Presented at the

MidSouth Educational Research Association Conference
Chattanooga, Tennessee

November 7, 2002

TM034647

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Lindsey

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

This study determined the mild disabilities certification perceptions and preferences of Louisiana special education (SPED) professionals and students. A stratified, random sampling procedure was used to select the subjects that included 115 undergraduate and 44 graduate students, 26 professors, 24 local or school system directors of SPED, and 22 state department SPED administrators (population = 576). Between-subjects designs were utilized and the factors were status/position, gender, ethnicity, disability status, and knowledge of Louisiana's type of mild disabilities certification. The dependent variables were the subjects' categorical certification perceptual scores for students with mild disabilities (learning disabilities, emotional disturbance, mental disabilities) by programming areas (assessment, behavior development/management, instruction, collaboration, and school-home cooperation) and preferences for categorical or multicategorical/ generic certification under three assumed roles (Louisiana SPED director, SPED teacher, parent of a child with mild disabilities). SPSS 11 descriptive, ANOVA, Krushal-Wallis H Test, Mann-Whitney U Test, and chi-square statistics were used for data analysis (alpha level $p < .01$). Findings suggested that status/position and disability status affected subjects' mild disabilities certification perceptual scores for specific educational programming areas and students with mild disabilities (e.g., undergraduates and subjects with a disability had higher categorical scores). Subjects also had different preferences for mild disabilities certification under selected assumed roles (e.g., Louisiana Director of SPED and special-education setting: professors and subjects with a disability preferred categorical certification). Significant and non-significant results were presented and discussed. The findings of this study will add to the SPED literature and can be used by SPED policy makers addressing certification for teachers of students with mild disabilities.

Certification in Mild Disabilities: Perceptions and Preferences of Louisiana Special Education Professionals and Students

Introduction

The United States (U.S.) educational system is in a critical period of rapid change ("Top teacher tackles testing," 2001 October). The U.S. Office of Education, state departments of education, accrediting bodies, learned societies, and teacher-educators in higher learning are seeking reform in what is taught, how it is taught, who is teaching, and the relationship between measured outcomes and the curricula. These issues are of significance to both general- and special-education and decisions made will have significant impact on students with and without disabilities. Kauffman (1999) indicated that special education, as a profession, is going through a crisis. He designated changes in the following areas as indicators: (a) shifts in services and staffing patterns, (b) changes in the boundaries of special education, (c) changes in teacher training and certification, and (d) less focus on scientific understanding of instruction. Of these indicators identified by Kauffman, it appears that the changes associated with teacher training and certifications in special education are of paramount importance, and these changes have sparked an ongoing debate in special education.

As reported in *CEC Today* (1999, November/December), the official newsletter of the Council for Exceptional Children, the issue of categorical versus multicategorical/ generic certification deserves serious consideration. This consideration must result with a determination if one type of certification better meets the needs of students with disabilities, how the disability categories should be broken down, and what certification will best prepare special-education teachers to teach in today's general/inclusive and segregated classrooms. Special education professionals have presented different

points of view on the issue of certification (see "References," n.d.). For example, Hunt and Marshall (2002) reported that:

> Some individuals agree with the categorical model for service delivery, because they believe it increases the probability that the students in a class will have similar needs. They feel that teaching procedures, or at least the primary emphasis of instruction, is different for students with ... mental retardation ... than for students with learning disabilities or behavior disorders. (p. 18)

On the other hand, Ysseldyke and Marston (1999) have addressed the origins of categorical special education services and have presented a rationale for changing them.

Gingras and Mauser (1992) surveyed state directors of special education and state certification officers to examine the trend toward or away from categorical teacher certification. Their findings indicated that states offering categorical certification outnumbered those with multicategorical/generic. However, their results also indicated a trend toward multicategorical/generic models. Furthermore, Andrews (2000) surveyed directors of state departments in the United States and found that 34 states have only multicategorical/generic certification, four states have only categorical certification, and 23 states have a combination of categorical and multicategorical/generic certification. Louisiana is designated as one of the states having a mixture of categorical and multicategorical/generic certification, and it adopted multicategorical/generic certification for special-education teachers working with students with mild disabilities (e.g., learning disabilities [LD], emotional disturbance [ED/BD], and mental disabilities [MD/MR]).

A growing number of special educators are contending that it is impossible for

training programs with a multicategorical or generic perspective to teach preservice teachers the knowledge and skills they need to assume their professional responsibilities for students with different disabilities. As reported in *CEC Today* (1999, November/December), William Healey of the University of Nevada stated that multicategorical/generic certification is causing the profession to become less specific and specialized. This position highlights the possibility of potential pitfalls for preparing special-education generalists and not specialists to meet the specific needs of students with different disabilities. A brief review of the extant literature revealed that very little empirical data exist that support either categorical or multicategorical/generic certification (see "References," n.d.). For example, one published study reported that type of teacher certification did not affect the achievement of students with LD and MD/MR (see Marston, 1987), but no studies were found that investigated the perceptions or preferences of special-education stakeholders for the type of certification that best prepares special-education teachers to meet the needs of students with disabilities.

It was the purpose of this study to determine the categorical mild disabilities certification perceptions of Louisiana special-education professionals and students by selected subject factors (e.g., status/position, gender, etc.), educational programming areas, and type of mild disability. The educational programming areas considered were assessment, behavior development/management, instruction in an inclusive setting, instruction in a special-education setting, collaboration, and home-school cooperation (Bos & Vaughn, 2002; Henley, Ramesy, & Algozinne, 2002; Mercer & Mercer, 1998). The types of mild disabilities considered were LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR. Louisiana

provided special-education services to 54,339 students with LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR ages 6 to 21 during 1999-2000 (see United States Department of Education, 2001). This study also determined if there were differences or associations among the professionals' and students' preferences for categorical or multicategorical/generic certification, under three assumed roles (e.g., Louisiana director of special education, special-education teacher, and parent of a child with LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR), by selected subject factors (e.g., status/position), instructional setting (inclusive and special education), and type of mild disability (e.g., LD). The two research questions used to guide this investigation were:

> By educational programming areas and type of mild disability, do selected subject factors affect the categorical mild disabilities certification perceptions of Louisiana special-education professionals and students?
>
> Under three assumed roles (e.g., Louisiana director of special education), are there differences or associations between selected subject variables and Louisiana special-education professionals' and students' preference(s) for the type of certification that best prepares special-education teachers to work with students with mild disabilities in inclusive and special-education settings?

The findings of this study are unique and will add to the emerging literature associated with special-education mild disabilities certification and related training. They could also be used by individuals in teacher-education programs, state departments of education, and accrediting agencies in their on-going debate associated with the type of certification training that best prepares special-education teachers to work with students with mild disabilities.

Method

Subjects

The population for this study was undergraduate and graduate students in special-education classes at two Louisiana universities, 30 professors at two Louisiana universities, 66 local or system (parish or city) directors of special education, and 36 Louisiana state department special-education administrators (N = 576). A stratified, random sampling procedure was used to select the subjects (see Ary, Jacobs, & Razavieh, 2002) and 115 undergraduate and 44 graduate students, 26 professors, 24 directors of special education, and 22 state department special-education administrators agreed to participate and completed the questionnaire. Table 1 (see Appendix A) presents the subjects' status/position, general characteristics, and knowledge of Louisiana's type of certification for mild disabilities. The majority of the subjects responding were female (N = 197), Caucasian (N = 153), were 18 to 30 years old (N = 116), had earned a minimum of their high school diploma or an associate degree (N = 111), did not have a disability (N = 220), and did not know Louisiana's type of mild disabilities certification (N = 40).

Research Design and Analyses

One-way between-subjects designs (see Gravetter & Wallnau, 2000) were utilized to conduct the perceptions of categorical mild disabilities certification component of this study. The factors for the designs were the subjects' status/position (undergraduate or graduate student, professor, director of special education, and state department special-education administrator), gender (male and female), ethnicity (Caucasian, African American, and other), disability status (have and do not have a

disability), and knowledge of Louisiana's type of mild disabilities certification (know and do not know the type). Where appropriate, these factors were matched with six educational programming areas (e.g., assessment, behavior development/management, instruction in an inclusive setting, instruction in a special-education setting, collaboration, and home-school cooperation) and three types of mild disabilities (e.g., LD, ED/BD, MD/MR). The dependent variable was the subjects' categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual score obtained using a researcher-developed questionnaire. SPSS 11 descriptive (e.g., measures of central tendency and variability) and analysis of variance (ANOVA) modules were used to analyze the subjects' categorical mild disabilities perceptual scores. Where the ANOVA assumption of homogeneity of variance was not met, the perceptual scores were changed to ranks and analyzed using the Kruskal-Wallis H Test and Mann-Whitney U Test. For significant Kruskal-Wallis finding, the Mann-Whitney U Test was used for *post hoc* analyses to separate groups (Heiman, 2000), and the group with the highest average rank had the higher mild disabilities perceptual score (George & Mallery, 2000). Null hypotheses were tested at the .01 level of significance ($p < .01$).

Also, two-way between-subjects designs and SPSS 11 crosstabs and chi-square procedures were used to determine if there were differences or associations between the subjects' status/position, gender, ethnicity, disability status, knowledge of Louisiana's type of mild disabilities certification, and type of setting (e.g., inclusive or special education) and their preference(s) for the type of certification that best prepares special-education teachers to work with students with mild disabilities (under three assumed roles - Louisiana director of special education, special education teacher, and

parent of a child with LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR). Null hypotheses for these analyses were tested at the .01 significance level.

Instrument

A three-part questionnaire was developed to collect needed study data. Part I requested the respondents to identify or provide general demographic characteristics (gender, ethnicity, etc.), educational level (highest diploma/degree), status/position (e.g., undergraduate or graduate student, professor, etc.), professional certifications and experiences, and other information (e.g., type of certification Louisiana uses for mild disabilities). The second part used a four-point Likert scale to obtain respondents' perceptions about the best type of certification (categorical or multicategorical/generic) to prepare special-education teachers to work with students with LD, ED/BD, MD/MR (e.g., assessment, behavior development/management, etc.). Part III requested the respondents to assume the role of a state director of special education, a special education teacher, and a parent of a child with LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR and identify their preference for the type of certification (categorical or multicategorical/generic) for special-education teachers working with students with mild disabilities in an inclusive and special-education settings.

The questionnaire was validated by a panel that consisted of six special-education professionals having experience in both categorical and multicategorical/generic certifications to ensure the appropriateness of its measurement with regard to both face and content validity. The panel's recommendations were incorporated into the final questionnaire that was disseminated to the subjects.

A test-retest procedure (see Barbie, 2001) was used to determine the reliability of

questionnaire responses , and Pearson-Product Moment correlations were calculated and found to be within acceptable ranges (e.g., .70 or higher). Also, a Cronbach alpha procedure (see George & Mallory, 2000) was used to determine the internal consistency of the subjects' 18 categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual responses, and a reliability coefficient of .9610 was obtained.

General Procedures

This study was conducted using survey procedures recommended by Gall, Borg, and Gall (2003) and Ary et al. (2002). First, research questions were generated as the bases for this study that examined special-education stakeholders' categorical mild disabilities certification perceptions and preferences for special-education teachers working with students with LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR (e.g., assessment, behavior development/management, etc.). Second, a questionnaire to collect study data was developed, validated, and tested for reliability. Third, permission was requested and granted by the Southern University - Baton Rouge Institutional Review Board for the Protection of Human Subjects to undertake the study. Fourth, a power analysis was conducted to determine the number of subjects needed, and a stratified, random sampling procedure was used to generate the sample from the population. Fifth, questionnaires were disseminated or sent to the subjects selected to participate in this study, and two follow-up procedures were used to obtain questionnaires that were not returned. Sixth, subjects' questionnaire responses were coded, and SPSS 11 was used to create the data set and analyze data.

Results

Status/Position and Perception of Categorical Mild Disabilities Certification

Table 2 (see Appendix A) presents the subjects' categorical mild disabilities perceptual means and standard deviations by status/position, educational programming areas (assessment, behavior development/ management, etc.), and the type of mild disability (LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR). Because the ANOVA assumption of homogeneity of variance was not met, the scores were changed to ranks and analyzed using Kruskal-Wallis H Test. Mann-Whitney U Tests were used to separate groups for significant results. Kruskal-Wallis findings (see Appendix A Table 3) indicated that status/position affected the subjects' categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual scores ($p <$ .01) by the following programming areas and type of mild disability: (a) assessment for students with LD – undergraduate students had a higher average rank than professors and directors of special education (125.36 vs. 89.77 and 77.75) while graduate students had a higher average rank than directors of special education (119.72 vs. 77.36). The other average rank score comparisons were not significant. By knowing status/position, we can account for 7.67% of the variance in the subjects' assessment for students with LD categorical mild disabilities categorical certification perceptual score ($eta^2 = .0767$ – see Heiman, 2000); (b) assessment for students with MD/MR – undergraduate students had a higher average rank than professors (129.42 vs. 85.54) and directors of special education (129.42 vs. (83.25). The other average rank score comparisons were statistically similar. By knowing status/position, we can account for 8.34% of the variance in the subjects' assessment for students with MD/MR categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual score ($eta^2 = .0834$ – see Heiman, 2000); (c) behavior development/ management for students with LD – undergraduate students had a higher average rank than professors (128.02 vs. 92.85), directors of special education

(128.02 vs. 69.75), and state department special-education administrators (128.02 vs. 97.20). Graduate students had a higher average rank than directors of special education (124.47 vs. 69.75). The other average rank score comparisons were not significant. By knowing status/position, we can account for 10.67% of the variance in the subjects' behavior development/management for students with LD categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual score (eta^2 = .1067 – see Heiman, 2000); (d) behavior development/ management for students with MD/MR – undergraduate and graduate students had a higher average rank than professors (129.58 and 116.48 vs. 85.00) and directors of special education (129.58 and 116.48 vs. 86.83). The other average rank score comparisons were statistically similar. By knowing status/position, we can account for 9.51% of the variance in the subjects' behavior development/ management for students with MD/MR categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual score (eta^2 = .0951 – see Heiman, 2000); (e) instruction in an inclusive setting for students with LD – undergraduate students had a higher average rank than professors (125.34 vs. 99.67) and directors of special education (125.34 vs. 67.26), graduate students had a higher average rank than directors of special education (110.49 vs. 67.26), and state department special-education administrators had a higher average rank than directors of special education (117.88 vs. 67.26). The other average rank score comparisons were not significant. By knowing status/position, we can account for 8.67% of the variance in the subjects' instruction in an inclusive setting for students with LD categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual score (eta^2 = .0867 – see Heiman, 2000); (f) instruction in an inclusive setting for students with MD/MR – undergraduate students had a higher average rank than professors (125.71 vs. 99.04),

and state department special-education administrators had a higher average rank than directors of special education (117.20 vs. 78.06). The other average rank score comparisons were statistically similar. By knowing status/position, we can account for 6.25% of the variance in the subjects' instruction in an inclusive setting for students with LD categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual score (eta^2 = .0625 – see Heiman, 2000); (g) instruction in a special-education setting for students with LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR - undergraduate and graduate students had a higher average rank than directors of special education (LD – 130.01 and 107.83 vs. 63.46;ED/BD- 125.78 and 110.75 vs. 73.27; MD/MR – 130.79 and 104.06 vs. 73.90). The other average rank score comparisons were not significant. By knowing status/position, we can account for 12.80%, 7.71%, and 10.91% of the variance respectively in the subjects' instruction in a special-education setting for students with LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual scores (eta^2 = .12.80, .0771, and .1091 – see Heiman, 2000); (h) collaboration for students with LD - undergraduate and graduate students had a higher average rank than directors of special education (132.12 and 112.35 vs. 65.25) and state department special education administrators (132.12 and 112.35 vs. 73.93). The other average rank score comparisons were statistically similar. By knowing status/position, we can account for 15.58% of the variance in the subjects' collaboration for students with LD categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual score (eta^2 = .1558 – see Heiman, 2000) ; (i) collaboration for students with ED/BD and MD/MR - undergraduate students had a higher average rank than directors of special education (ED/BD – 132.05 vs. 71.42; MD/MR – 135.82 vs. 67.04) and state department special-education administrators (ED/BD – 132.05 vs. 81.80; MD/MR –

135.82 vs. 78.18) while graduate students had a higher average rank than directors of special education (ED/BD – 113.05 vs. 71.42; MD/MR – 103.53 vs. 67.04). The other average rank score comparisons were not significant. By knowing status/position, we can account for 12.53% and 16.30% of the variance respectively in the subjects' collaboration for students with ED/BD and MD/MR categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual scores (eta^2 = .1253 and .1630 – see Heiman, 2000); and (g) home-school cooperation for students with LD and MD/MR - undergraduate students had a higher average rank than directors of special education (LD - 123.86 vs. 72.10; MD/MR – 126.20 vs. 73.52) and state department special-education administrators (LD – 123.86 vs. 97.35; MD/MR – 126.20 vs. 99.15), and graduate students had a higher average rank than directors of special education (LD – 121.86 vs. 72.10; MD/MR – 114.86 vs. 73.52). The other average rank score comparisons were statistically similar. By knowing status/position, we can account for 7.82% and 7.38% of the variance respectively in the subjects' home-school cooperation for students with LD and MD/MR categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual scores (eta^2 = .0767 – see Heiman, 2000).

Gender and Perception of Categorical Mild Disabilities Certification

Table 4 (see Appendix A) presents the subjects' categorical mild disabilities perceptual means and standard deviations by gender, educational programming areas, and type of mild disability. ANOVA findings indicated that gender did not affect the subjects' categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual scores (see Appendix A Table 3).

Ethnicity and Perceptions of Categorical Mild Disabilities Certification

Table 5 (see Appendix A) presents the subjects' categorical mild disabilities perceptual means and standard deviations by ethnicity, educational programming areas, and type of mild disability. ANOVA and Kruskal-Wallis H Test findings indicated that ethnicity did not affect the subjects' categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual scores (see Appendix A Table 3).

Disability Status and Perception of Categorical Mild Disabilities Certification

Table 6 (see Appendix A) presents the subjects' categorical mild disabilities perceptual means and standard deviations by disability status, educational programming areas, and type of mild disability. ANOVA findings indicated that disability status affected the subjects' categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual scores for instruction in a special-education setting for students with LD – $F(1, 221) = 8.59$, $p = .004$ (see Appendix A Table 3). Subjects who had a disability had a higher categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual mean score than subjects without a disability (3.6 vs. 2.88). By knowing disability status, we can account for 3.74% of the variance in their instruction in a special-education setting categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual score ($eta^2 = .0374$ – see Heiman, 2000). Disability status did not affect the subjects' categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual scores for the other programming areas (including special-education setting for students with ED/BD and MD/MR) and type of mild disability (see Appendix A Table 3).

Knowledge of Louisiana's Type of Mild Disabilities Certification and Perception of Categorical Mild Disabilities Certification

Table 7 (see Appendix A) presents the subjects' categorical mild disabilities

perceptual means and standard deviations by knowledge of Louisiana's type of mild disabilities certification, educational programming areas (e.g., assessment, behavior development/ management, etc.), and type of mild disability (LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR). ANOVA and Mann-Whitney U Test findings indicated that knowledge of Louisiana's type of mild disabilities certification did not affect the subjects' categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual scores (see Appendix A Table 3).

Preference for Type of Mild Disabilities Certification by Factors, Assumed Roles, and Instructional Settings

Status/Position. Table 8 (see Appendix A) presents a summary of subjects' preferences and chi-square findings for type of mild disabilities certification by status/position and instructional setting if they were the Louisiana director of special education. With respect to a special-education setting, findings suggest that undergraduate students and professors preferred categorical certification while directors of special education and state department special-education administrators preferred multicategorical/generic certification ($X^2 = 15.764$, df = 4, $p = .003$). The association between status/position and type of mild disabilities certification for an inclusive setting was not significant ($X^2 = 8.547$, df = 4, $p = .073$).

Table 9 (see Appendix A) presents a summary of subjects' preferences for type of mild disabilities certification by status/position and instructional setting if they were a special-education teacher and chi-square findings. With respect to a special-education setting, findings suggest that undergraduate students preferred categorical certification while graduate students, directors of special education, and state department special-

education administrators preferred multicategorical/generic certification (X^2 = 13.796, df = 4, p = .008). The association between status/position and type of mild disabilities certification for an inclusive setting was not significant (X^2 = 5.469, df = 4, p = .242).

By status/position and if the subjects were a parent of a child with mild disabilities, the associations between status/position and type of mild disabilities certification for a child with LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR were not significant.

Gender, Ethnicity, Disability Status, and Knowledge of Louisiana's Type of Mild Disabilities Certification. By gender, ethnicity, disability status, and knowledge of Louisiana's type of mild disabilities certification and if the subjects were the state director of special education or a special-education teacher, the associations between the factors (e.g., gender, ethnicity, etc.) and type of mild disabilities certification for inclusive and special-education settings were not significant. Also, and by the above factors and if the subjects were a parent of a child with mild disabilities, the associations between gender, ethnicity, disability status, and knowledge of Louisiana's type of mild disabilities certification and type of mild disabilities certification for a child with LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR were not significant.

Discussion

The debate on type of certification necessary to meet the needs of individuals with disabilities is an interesting and controversial dilemma. Empirical data become a high priority to clarify popular opinions and pundit driven postulations. Therefore, the findings of this study are essential for clarification and validation of a research driven resolution to the debate.

Categorical Mild Disabilities Certification Perceptual Findings

The categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual findings of this study suggest that status/position affected the subjects' perceptual scores in all programming areas for students with LD and MD/MR. In general, undergraduate students had higher categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual scores than professors and directors of special education. Additionally, undergraduate students had significantly higher perceptual scores than directors of special education in the programming areas of instruction in a special-education setting, collaboration, and home-school cooperation for students with ED/BD. However, no significant findings were obtained for status/position in the programming areas of assessment, behavior development/management, and instruction in an inclusive setting for students with ED/BD.

It is conceivable that undergraduate students perceive that, due to their specialized training and focus in the preparation for teaching students with disabilities, a categorical certification would be preferable. On the other hand, professors, directors of special education, and state department special-education administrators due to their experiences with Louisiana's generic/multicategorical system, philosophy for special education for students with mild disabilities, and being more conscious of rising costs and the difficulty of findings qualified special-education teachers to fill the available positions are more inclined to perceive that a generic/multicategorical certification would meet the needs of students with mild disabilities. These findings are similar to the reported perspective of Ysseldyke and Marston (1999) and the results of Andrews' (2000) survey of U.S. directors of special education (i.e., the trend that states are

moving toward generic/multicategorical certification).

Similarly, professors who may have a categorical certification in one area (e.g., MD/MR) and find themselves teaching courses in other areas (e.g., LD or ED/BD) are more inclined to perceive a favorable position for generic/multicategorical certification of teachers for teaching students with mild disabilities. The reason they may be teaching courses outside their area of categorical certification is because departments of special education in the universities around the country find it hard to hire specialized faculty in all categorical areas, and moreover, it is not cost effective because of low enrollment in special education.

Disability status affected the subjects' categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual scores for instruction in a special-education setting for students with LD. Subjects who had a disability had the higher perceptual scores. However, disability status did not affect the subjects' categorical mild disabilities certification perceptual scores for other programming areas for students with ED/BD and MD/MR. This finding may be attributed to the experiential background of those subjects with a disability who received special education services at some point during their education. The findings for LD only may also be attributed to the fact that most subjects who indicated a disability had a learning disability.

Certification Preference Findings Under Assumed Roles

The certification preference findings of this study suggest that Louisiana local or system directors of special education and state department special-education administrators, if they were the Louisiana director of special education, preferred generic/multicategorical certification for teachers working with students with mild

disabilities (e.g., LD, ED/BD, MD/MR) in special-education settings while undergraduate students and professors preferred special-education teachers to have categorical certification. The variation in preference may be attributed to the directors' and state department special-education administrators' (a) associated professional experiences within Louisiana's generic/multicategorical certification system for mild disabilities, (b) special-education philosophy that students with LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR exhibit similar academic and other problems that require comparable educational programming, (c) concerns about the rising cost of special education services, and (d) difficulty in hiring certified special education teachers. Also, Louisiana directors of special education and state department special-education administrators may emphasize teacher functional consistency and flexibility as being more important than a high rate of student skill acquisition within any type of classroom because of differences in intensity of instruction. In contrast, undergraduate students and professors may consider that teachers working in special-education settings need categorical certification to understand and meet the specific needs of students with LD, ED/BD, or MD/MR so that these exceptional learners will have disability-specific intensive programming and return to the general-education or inclusive classroom as quickly as possible. As a result, the findings imply that, through state performance standards, special-education preservice programs may develop a decreased emphasis on content knowledge with an increased emphasis on adapting instruction due to program time constraints.

The certification preference findings also suggest that graduate students, directors of special education, and state department special-education administrators, if they were a special education teacher, preferred generic/multicategorical certification for

teachers working with students with mild disabilities in special education settings. Conversely, undergraduate students preferred categorical certification. Again, the Louisiana special-education generic/multicategorical experiences and mild disabilities philosophies of graduate students, directors of special education, and state department special-education administrators may account for their preference for generic/multicategorical certification for teachers working with students with LD, ED/BD, and MD/MR in special education settings. Undergraduate student's preference for categorical certification may be a result of their lack of experience in general- and special-education settings as compared with other subjects or their difficulty assuming the role of a special-education teacher. As a result, the findings imply that if special-education teachers receive generic/multicategorical certification more role flexibility is offered to meet the needs of students with mild disabilities. Additionally, a benefit of this flexibility is increased collaboration among professionals resulting in improved student learning.

Limitations of the Study

This study had a number of limitations. The main limitations were: (a) the study was limited to undergraduate and graduate students and professors in only two Louisiana universities; (b) many of the respondents did not complete all parts of the questionnaire. For instance, only 76 subjects responded to the item on the type of certification Louisiana uses for mild disabilities; (c) a majority of the participants were undergraduate students (49.8%) who may not have given serious consideration to the issue at hand. Therefore, the significance of the findings must be viewed with caution; and (d) data were collected using a questionnaire. There are inherent weaknesses in

this methodology, including unanswered items, misinterpretation of questions, etc. Another limitation of the study was the number of statistical analyses performed and the use of .01 as the probability for significance.

Recommendations for Future Research

Four recommendations are made for future research. They include: (a) increasing the number of special-education students and professionals, particularly undergraduate and graduate students and professors from other Louisiana universities. General- and special-education teachers should be included in future studies; (b) selecting parents/guardians of students with mild disabilities to serve as subjects; (c) administrating the questionnaire, where appropriate, in a group format to increase the response rate and responding to all questionnaire items; (e) selecting special-education higher education students and professionals from neighboring states or regions and comparing the findings with those found in this study; and (e) revising the questionnaire to enhance the clarity of directions, to generate additional information, and to increase the completion of items. For example, an item to obtain special-education administrative experience should be added, and item 22 (type of mild disabilities certification used by the state) should be moved to Part I of the questionnaire.

References

Andrews, T. E. (Ed.). (2000). *The NASDTEC manual 2000.* Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Ary, D, Jacobs, L. C., & Razavieh, A. (2002). Introduction *to research in education (6th ed.).* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Barbie, E. (2001). *The practice of social research (9th ed.).* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomason Learning.

Bos, C. S., & Vaughn, S. (2002). *Strategies for teaching students with learning and behavior problems (5th ed.)*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

The debate: Multicategorical vs. categorical licensure. (1999, November/December). *CEC Today, 6*, 1, 5, 15.

Gall, M. D., Gall, J. P., & Borg, W. R. (2003). *Educational research: An introduction (7th ed.)*. White Plains, NY: Longman.

George, D., & Mallery, P. (2000). *SPSS for Windows: Step by step (9.0 Update)*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Gingras, A. C., & Mauser, A. J. (1992). Categorical and noncategorical teacher certification in special education: How wide is the gap? *Remedial and Special Education, 13*(4), 6-9.

Gravetter, F. J., & Wallnau, L. B. (2000). *Statistics for the behavioral sciences (5th ed.)*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.

Heiman, G. W. (2003). *Basic statistics for the behavioral sciences (4th ed.)*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Henley, M., Ramsey, R., & Algozzine, R. (2002). *Characteristics of and Strategies for Teaching Children and Adolescents with Mild Disabilities (4th ed.)*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Hunt, N., & Marshall, K. (2002). *Exceptional children and youth* (3rd ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Kauffman, J. M. (1999). Commentary: Today's special education and its messages for tomorrow. *The Journal of Special Education, 32*, 244-254.

Mercer, C. D., & Mercer, A. R. (1998). *Teaching children with learning and behavior*

problems (5th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill/Prentice-Hall

References. (n.d.). Downloaded November 1, 2002. http://www.coe.ufl.edu/references/CertificationOptionsRef.htm.

Top teacher tackles testing: Teacher of the year Michele Forman questions "obsession with testing." (2001, October). *NEA Today, 20*(2), 211.

United States Department of Education. (2001). *Twenty-third report to Congress on the implementation of the Individuals with Disabilities Act: Appendix A*. Washington, DC: United States Printing Office.

Ysseldyke, J. E., & Marston, D. (1999). Origins of categorical special education services in schools and a rationale for changing them. In D. Reschly, W. D. Tilly, & J. Grimes (Eds.), *Special education in transition: Functional assessment and noncategorical programming*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Appendix A

Tables 1 – 9

Table 1

Subjects' Status/Position, General Characteristics, and Knowledge of Louisiana's Type of Certification for Mild Disabilities

Factor	Condition	N	%
Status/Position	Undergraduate Student	115	49.8
	Graduate Student	44	19.0
	Professor	26	11.3
	LA Director of Special Education	24	10.4
	LA State Department SPED Administrators	22	9.5
Gender	Male	31	13.6
	Female	197	86.4
Ethnicity	Caucasian	153	66.5
	African American	68	29.6
	Other	9	3.9
Age	18 –22 Years	75	32.6
	23 – 30 Years	41	17.8
	31 – 40 Years	31	13.5
	41 – 50 Years	43	18.7
	51 – 60 Years	34	14.8
	61+ Years	6	2.6
Highest Diploma/Degree	High School Diploma/GED	105	45.9
	Associate Degree	6	2.6
	Bachelor	41	17.9
	Master	59	25.8
	Educational Specialist	6	2.6
	Doctoral	12	5.2
Disability Status	Have a Disability	10	4.4
	Do Have a Disability	220	95.6
Know of Louisiana's Type of Certification for Mild Disabilities	Know the Type	36	47.4
	Do Not Know the Type	40	52.6

Table 2

Summary of Subjects' Categorical Certification Perceptual Means and Standard Deviations by Position/Status, Programming Area, and Type of Mild Disabilities

Position/ Status	*Programming Area*	*Type of Mild Disability*	*N*	*Mn*	*S.D*
	Assessment	LD	115	3.10	.72
		ED/BD	115	3.12	.64
		MD/MR	115	3.13	.71
	Behavior Develop/	LD	115	3.07	.70
	Management	ED/BD	115	3.11	.62
		MD/MR	115	3.13	.67
	Instruction: Inclusive	LD/BD	114	2.91	.66
	Setting	ED	114	2.90	.68
		MD/MR	114	2.88	.67
Undergraduate	Instruction: Special-	LD	113	3.13	.62
Student	Education Setting	ED/BD	113	3.15	.56
		MD/MR	113	3.12	.60
	Collaboration	LD	113	3.05	.68
		ED/BD	115	3.07	.60
		MD/MR	114	3.09	.65
	Home-School	LD	112	2.82	.69
	Cooperation	ED/BD	112	2.86	.66
		MD/MR	112	2.89	.72
	Assessment	LD	41	3.05	.74
		ED/BD	43	3.07	.74
		MD/MR	43	2.91	.81
	Behavior Develop/	LD	43	3.02	.77
	Management	ED/BD	43	3.09	.68
		MD/MR	43	2.95	.76
	Instruction: Inclusive	LD	42	2.74	.83
Graduate	Setting	ED/BD	42	2.81	.80
Student		MD/MR	42	2.64	.91
	Instruction: Special-	LD	42	2.86	.81
	Education Setting	ED/BD	42	2.95	.83
		MD/MR	42	2.76	.85
		LD	42	2.79	.84
	Collaboration	ED/BD	43	2.81	.85
		MD/MR	43	2.65	.90
	Home-School	LD	43	2.77	.87
	Cooperation	ED/BD	43	2.77	.81
		MD/MR	43	2.72	.85
	Assessment	LD	26	2.58	1.06
		ED/BD	26	2.70	1.09
		MD/MR	26	2.50	1.07

	Behavior Develop/ Management	LD	26	2.54	1.10
		ED/BD	26	2.81	1.02
		MD/MR	26	2.46	1.88
	Instruction: Inclusive Setting	LD	26	2.58	1.10
Professor		ED/BD	26	2.73	1.04
		MD/MR	26	2.54	1.10
	Instruction: Special-Education Setting	LD	26	2.77	1.03
		ED/BD	26	2.85	1.05
		MD/MR	26	2.73	.77
	Collaboration	LD	26	2.69	1.05
		ED/BD	26	2.69	1.05
		MD/MR	26	2.54	1.03
	Home-School Cooperation	LD	26	2.54	1.03
		ED/BD	26	2.62	1.02
		MD/MR	26	2.54	1.02
	Assessment	LD	20	2.85	.88
		ED/BD	20	3.10	.79
		MD/MR	20	2.85	.81
	Behavior Develop/ Management	LD	24	2.29	..81
		ED/BD	24	2.63	.93
		MD/MR	24	2.42	.88
	Instruction: Inclusive Setting	LD	23	2.17	.72
Director of Special Education		ED/BD	24	2.42	.83
		MD/MR	24	2.25	.68
	Instruction: Special-Education Setting	LD	23	2.30	.64
		ED/BD	24	2.50	.66
		MD/MR	24	2.42	.65
	Collaboration	LD	24	2.21	.66
		ED/BD	24	2.29	.81
		MD/MR	24	2.21	.66
	Home-School Cooperation	LD	24	2.21	.59
		ED/BD	24	2.33	.64
		MD/MR	24	2.25	.61
	Assessment	LD	20	2.85	.88
		ED/BD	20	3.10	.79
		MD/MR	20	2.85	.81
	Behavior Develop/ Management	LD	20	2.70	.66
		ED/BD	20	3.10	.72
		MD/MR	20	2.80	.83
	Instruction: Inclusive Setting	LD	20	2.85	.75
State Department Administrator		ED/BD	20	2.85	.81
		MD/MR	20	2.80	.77
	Instruction: Special-Education Setting	LD	20	2.65	.75
		ED/BD	20	2.85	.75
		MD/MR	20	2.65	.75
		LD	20	2.35	.49

Collaboration	ED/BD	20	2.45	.61
	MD/MR	20	2.35	.59
	LD	20	2.50	.76
Home-School Cooperation	ED/BD	20	2.55	.76
	MD/MR	20	2.55	.76

Table 3

Summary of ANOVA, Krushal-Wallis H Test, or Mann-Whitney U Test Findings for Subjects' Categorical Certification Perceptual Scores by Factors, Programming, and Type of Mild Disability

Subject Factors	*Programming Area*	*Type of Mild Disability*	*ANOVA, Krushal-Wallis, or Mann-Whitney Findings*
Position/ Status	Assessment	LD	$X^2 = 17.257$, df 4 = , $p = .002$
		ED/BD	$X^2 = 7.88$, df = 4, $p = .096$
		MD/MR	$X^2 = 18.922$, df 4 = , $p = .001$
	Behavior Develop/ Management	LD	$X^2 = 24.223$, df = 4, $p = .000$
		ED/BD	$X^2 = 7.750$, df = 4, $p = .101$
		MD/MR	$X^2 = 21.578$, df = 4, $p = .000$
	Instruction: Inclusive Setting	LD	$X^2 = 19.438$, df = 4, $p = .001$
		ED/BD	$X^2 = 7.943$, df = 4, $p = .094$
		MD/MR	$X^2 = 14.608$, df = 4, $p = .006$
	Instruction: Special-Education Setting	LD	$X^2 = 28.533$, df = 4, $p = .000$
		ED/BD	$X^2 = 17.274$, df 4= , $p = .002$
		MD/MR	$X^2 = 24.448$, df = 4, $p = .000$
	Collaboration	LD	$X^2 = 34.893$, df = 4, $p = .000$
		ED/BD	$X^2 = 28.432$, df = 4, $p = .000$
		MD/MR	$X^2 = 36.817$, df = 4, $p = .000$
	Home-School Cooperation	LD	$X^2 = 17.527$, df = 4, $p = .002$
		ED/BD	$X^2 = 12.804$, df = 4, $p = .012$
		MD/MR	$X^2 = 17.704$, df = 4, $p = .001$
Gender	Assessment	LD	$F(1,221) = 0.15$, $p = 701$
		ED/BD	$F(1,223) = 1.32$, $p = .251$
		MD/MR	$F(1,223) = 1.44$, $p = .232$
	Behavior Develop/ Management	LD	$F(1,223) = 0.31$, $p = .577$
		ED/BD	$F(1, 223) = 0.03$, $p = 861$
		MD/MR	$F(1,223) = 0.43$, $p = 513$
	Instruction: Inclusive Setting	LD	$F(1,220) = 1.52$, $p = .219$
		ED/BD	$F(1,221) = 0.02$, $p = .882$
		MD/MR	$F(1,221) = 0.09$, $p = .770$
	Instruction: Special-Education Setting	LD	$F(1,219) = 1.93$, $p = .166$
		ED/BD	$F(1,220) = 0.19$, $p = .663$
		MD/MR	$F(1,220) = 0.09$, $p = .771$
	Collaboration	LD	$F(1,220) = 6.82$, $p = .010$
		ED/BD	$F(1,223) = 0.84$, $p = .360$
		MD/MR	$F(1,222) = 1.87$, $p = .173$
	Home-School Cooperation	LD	$F(1,220) = 1.76$, $p = .186$
		ED/BD	$F(1,220) = 0.64$, $p = .424$
		MD/MR	$F(1,220) = 1.65$, $p = .200$
	Assessment	LD	$F(2,222) = 0.66$, $p = .516$
		ED/BD	$F(2,224) = 0.79$, $p = .456$

		MD/MR	$F(2,224) = 1.12$, $p = .329$
	Behavior Develop/ Management	LD	$F(2,224) = 0.09$, $p = .916$
		ED/BD	$X^2 = 0.256$, df = 2, $p = .880$
		MD/MR	$F(2,224) = 0.07$, $p = .938$
	Instruction: Inclusive Setting	LD	$F(2,221) = 0.32$, $p = .725$
Ethnicity		ED/BD	$F(2,222) = 0.30$, $p = .743$
		MD/MR	$F(2,222) = 0.56$, $p = .573$
	Instruction: Special-Education Setting	LD	$F(2,220) = 0.37$, $p = .690$
		ED/BD	$F(2,221) = 0.19$, $p = .826$
		MD/MR	$F(2,221) = 0.85$, $p = .429$
		LD	$F(2,221) = 0.04$, $p = .958$
	Collaboration	ED/BD	$F(2,224) = 1.09$, $p = .338$
		MD/MR	$F(2,223) = 0.30$, $p = .741$
	Home-School Cooperation	LD	$F(2,221) = 0.96$, $p = .385$
		ED/BD	$F(2,221) = 0.44$. $p = .646$
		MD/MR	$F(2,221) = 0.22$, $p = .801$
	Assessment	LD	$F(2,223) = 1.98$, $p = .161$
		ED/BD	$F(2,225) = 3.20$, $p = .075$
		MD/MR	$F(2,225) = 6.31$, $p = .013$
	Behavior Develop/ Management	LD	$F(1,225) = 0.57$, $p = .453$
		ED/BD	$F(1,225) = 0.10$, $p = .749$
		MD/MR	$F(1,225) = 4.26$, $p = .040$
	Instruction: Inclusive Setting	LD	$F(1,222) = 0.31$, $p = .579$
Disability Status		ED/BD	$F(1,223) = 0.59$, $p = .443$
		MD/MR	$F(1,223) = 0.25$, $p = .618$
	Instruction: Special-Education Setting	LD	$F(1.221) = 8.59$, $p = .004$
		ED/BD	$F(1,222) = 1.94$, $p = .066$
		MD/MR	$F(1,222) = 1.64$, $p = .201$
		LD	$F(1,222) = 5.79$, $p = .017$
	Collaboration	ED/BD	$F(1,225) = 5.38$, $p = .021$
		MD/MR	$F(1,224) = 2.50$ $p = .115$
	Home-School Cooperation	LD/BD	$F(1,222) = 0.21$, $p = .645$
		ED/BD	$F(1.222) = 0.02$, $p = .891$
		MD/MR	$F(1,222) = 0.10$, $p = .757$
	Assessment	LD	$F(1,72) = 1.64$, $p = .205$
		ED/BD	$U = 626.0$, $p = .506$
		MD/MR	$F(1,72) = 0.99$, $p = .322$
	Behavior Develop/ Management	LD	$F(1,72) = 2.84$, $p = .096$
		ED/BD	$U = 552.5$, $p = .099$
		MD/MR	$F(1,72) = 4.66$, $p = .034$
	Instruction: Inclusive Setting	LD	$F(1.70) = 0.11$, $p = .745$
Knowledge of Louisiana's Type of Mild Disabilities Certification		ED/BD	$F(1,71) = 0.00$, $p = .985$
		MD/MR	$F(1,71) = 0.03$, $p = .872$
	Instruction: Special-Education Setting	LD	$F(1,70) = 1.50$, $p = .225$
		ED/BD	$F(1,71) = 0.11$, $p = .744$
		MD/MR	$F(1,71) = 0.44$, $p = .507$

Collaboration	LD	$F(1,71) = 1.75$, $p = .190$
	ED/BD	$F(1,72) = 0.35$, $p = .554$
	MD/MR	$F(1,72) = 0.13$, $p = .718$
Home-School Cooperation	LD	$F(1,71) = 2.05$, $p = .157$
	ED/BD	$F(1,71) = 0.73$, $p = .395$
	MD/MR	$F(1,71) = 2.09$, $p = .152$

Table 4

Summary of Subjects' Categorical Certification Perceptual Means and Standard Deviations by Gender, Programming Area, and Type of Mild Disabilities

Gender	*Programming Area*	*Type of Mild Disability*	*N*	*Mn*	*S.D*
	Assessment	LD	29	2.90	.86
		ED/BD	30	2.87	.86
		MD/MR	30	2.88	.94
	Behavior Develop/	LD	30	2.97	.79
	Management	ED/BD	30	3.00	.79
		MD/MR	30	2.83	.87
	Instruction: Inclusive	LD	29	2.93	.88
	Setting	ED/BD	29	2.83	.76
Male		MD/MR	29	2.76	.83
	Instruction: Special-	LD	29	3.10	.82
	Education Setting	ED/BD	29	2.93	.70
		MD/MR	29	2.86	.88
	Collaboration	LD	29	3.17	.76
		ED/BD	30	2.97	.77
		MD/MR	29	3.00	.85
	Home-School	LD	30	2.87	.82
	Cooperation	ED/BD	30	2.83	.83
		MD/MR	30	2.90	.80
	Assessment	LD	194	2,96	,81
		ED/BD	195	3.04	.76
		MD/MR	195	2.96	.80
	Behavior Develop/	LD	195	2.88	.82
	Management	ED/BD	195	3.03	.74
		MD/MR	195	2.94	.81
	Instruction: Inclusive	LD	193	2.74	.78
	Setting	ED/BD	194	2.80	.80
		MD/MR	194	2.71	.81
	Instruction: Special-	LD	192	2.89	.76
	Education Setting	ED/BD	193	3.00	.74
		MD/MR	193	2.91	.75
		LD	193	2.76	.80
	Collaboration	ED/BD	195	2.83	.79
		MD/MR	195	2.78	.80
	Home-School	LD	192	2.66	.78
	Cooperation	ED/BD	192	2.71	.75
		MD/MR	192	2.70	.80

Table 5

Summary of Subjects' Categorical Certification Perceptual Means and Standard Deviations by Ethnicity, Programming Area, and Type of Mild Disabilities

Ethnicity	*Programming Area*	*Type of Mild Disability*	*N*	*Mn*	*S.D*
	Assessment	LD	152	2.92	.83
		ED/BD	152	3.01	.78
		MD/MR	152	2.92	.81
	Behavior Develop/	LD	152	2.89	.80
	Management	ED/BD	152	3.04	.72
		MD/MR	152	2.92	.81
	Instruction: Inclusive	LD	152	2.77	.79
Caucasian	Setting	ED/BD	152	2.80	.79
		MD/MR	152	2.74	.80
	Instruction: Special-	LD	151	2.89	.76
	Education Setting	ED/BD	151	2.99	.72
		MD/MR	151	2.89	.74
	Collaboration	LD	151	2.81	.78
		ED/BD	151	2.88	.71
		MD/MR	151	2.83	.81
	Home-School	LD	152	2.70	.79
	Cooperation	ED/BD	152	2.74	.77
		MD/MR	152	2.72	.82
	Assessment	LD	.64	2.98	.79
		ED/BD	66	3,00	.79
		MD/MR	66	2.94	.86
	Behavior Develop/	LD	66	2.88	.85
	Management	ED/BD	66	2.99	.78
		MD/MR	66	2.96	.83
	Instruction: Inclusive	LD	63	2.78	.79
African	Setting	ED/BD	64	2.86	.77
American		MD/MR	64	2.72	.79
	Instruction: Special-	LD	63	2.94	.78
	Education Setting	ED/BD	64	2.95	.77
		MD/MR	64	2.88	.81
		LD	64	2.81	.83
	Collaboration	ED/BD	66	2.73	.81
		MD/MR	66	2,74	.83
	Home-School	LD	63	2.62	.79
	Cooperation	ED/BD	63	2.62	.83
		MD/MR	66	2.74	..83
	Assessment	LD	9	3.22	.67
		ED/BD	9	3.33	.50
		MD/MR	9	3.33	.50

	Behavior Develop/ Management	LD	9	3.00	.87
		ED/BD	9	3.00	1.00
		MD/MR	9	2.89	.78
	Instruction: Inclusive Setting	LD	9	2.56	1.01
Other		ED/BD	9	2.67	.87
		MD/MR	9	2.44	1.01
	Instruction: Special-Education Setting	LD	9	3.11	.93
		ED/BD	9	3.11	.78
		MD/MR	9	3.22	.83
	Collaboration	LD	9	2,89	.93
		ED/BD	9	3.00	.71
		MD/MR	9	2,.78	.67
	Home-School Cooperation	LD	9	3.00	.71
		ED/BD	9	2.89	.60
		MD/MR	9	2.89	.78

Table 6

Summary of Subjects' Categorical Certification Perceptual Means and Standard Deviations by Disability Status, Programming Area, and Type of Mild Disabilities

Disability Status	*Programming Area*	*Type of Mild Disability*	*N*	*Mn*	*S.D.*
Have a Disability	Assessment	LD	10	2.60	.95
		ED/BD	10	2.60	.97
		MD/MR	10	2.30	.82
	Behavior Develop/ Management	LD	10	2.70	116
		ED/BD	10	3.10	.88
		MD/MR	10	2.40	.97
	Instruction: Inclusive Setting	LD	10	2.90	.99
		ED/BD	10	3.00	.67
		MD/MR	10	2.60	.97
	Instruction: Special-Education Setting	LD	10	3.60	.52
		ED/BD	10	3.30	.68
		MD/MR	10	3.20	.79
	Collaboration	LD	10	3.40	.52
		ED/BD	10	3.40	.52
		MD/MR	10	3.20	.97
	Home-School Cooperation	LD	10	2.80	.92
		ED/BD	10	2.70	,82
		MD/MR	10	2.80	1.03
Do Not Have a Disability	Assessment	LD	215	2.97	.80
		ED/BD	217	3.04	.75
		MD/MR	217	2.96	.82
	Behavior Develop/ Management	LD	217	2.80	.80
		ED/BD	217	3.02	.74
		MD/MR	217	2.95	.81
	Instruction: Inclusive Setting	LD	214	2.76	,79
		ED/BD	215	2.81	.79
		MD/MR	215	2.73	.80
	Instruction: Special-Education Setting	LD	213	2.88	.77
		ED/BD	214	2.97	.73
		MD/MR	214	2.88	.76
	Collaboration	LD	217	2.78	.79
		ED/BD	217	2.82	.78
		MD/MR	216	2.79	.81
	Home-School Cooperation	LD	214	2.68	.78
		ED/BD	214	2.73	.76
		MD/MR	214	2.72	.79

Table 7

Summary of Subjects' Categorical Certification Perceptual Means and Standard Deviations by Knowledge Louisiana's Type of Mild Disabilities Certification, Programming Area, and Type of Mild Disabilities

Knowledge	*Programming Area*	*Type of Mild Disability*	*N*	*Mn*	*S.D*
	Assessment	LD	35	2.57	.92
		ED/BD	35	2.71	.93
		MD/	35	2.60	.88
	Behavior Develop/	LD	35	2.49	.92
	Management	ED/BD	35	2.66	.97
		MD/MR	35	2.46	.92
	Instruction: Inclusive	LD	34	2.65	.88
Know	Setting	ED/BD	35	2.71	.93
Louisiana's		MD/MR	35	2.60	.88
Type of Mild	Instruction: Special-	LD	34	2.68	.88
Disabilities	Education Setting	ED/BD	35	2.80	.91
Certification		MD/MR	35	2.69	.87
	Collaboration	LD	35	2.54	.82
		ED/BD	35	2.63	.88
		MD/MR	35	2.60	.81
	Home-School	LD/BD	34	2.44	.82
	Cooperation	ED	34	2.53	.83
		MD/MR	34	2.47	.83
	Assessment	LD/BD	39	2.82	.76
		ED	39	2.87	.70
		MD/MR	39	2.80	.80
	Behavior Develop/	LD/BD	39	2.82	.79
	Management	ED	39	3.03	.63
		MD/MR	39	2.87	.73
Do Not Know	Instruction: Inclusive	LD	38	2.71	.77
Louisiana's	Setting	ED/BD	38	2.71	.73
Type of Mild		MD/MR	38	2.63	.79
Disabilities	Instruction: Special-	LD	38	2.92	.82
Certification	Education Setting	ED/BD	38	2.92	.75
		MD/MR	38	2.82	.80
		LD	38	2.79	.78
	Collaboration	ED/BD	39	2.74	.79
		MD/MR	39	2.67	.77
	Home-School	LD	39	2.72	.83
	Cooperation	ED/BD	39	2.70	.80
		MD/MR	39	2.74	.79

Table 8

Subjects' Preferences for Type of Mild Disabilities Certification by Instructional Setting and Position/Status If They Were the Louisiana Director of Special Education and Chi-Square Findings

Setting	*Position/Status*	*Type of Certification*	*N*	*Chi-Square Finding*
General Education or Inclusive	Undergraduate Student	Categorical	44	X^2 =
		Generic	69	8.547
	Graduate Student	Categorical	17	df = 4
		Generic	24	
				p = .073
	Professor	Categorical	8	
		Generic	18	
	Director of Special Education	Categorical	3	
		Generic	21	
	State Department Special-Education Administrator	Categorical	5	
		Generic	17	
Special Education	Undergraduate Student	Categorical	63	X^2 =
		Generic	49	15.764
	Graduate Student	Categorical	21	df = 4
		Generic	22	
				p = .003
	Professor	Categorical	15	
		Generic	11	
	Director of Special Education	Categorical	4	
		Generic	20	
	State Department Special-Education Administrator	Categorical	7	
		Generic	15	

Table 9

Subjects' Preferences for Type of Mild Disabilities Certification by Instructional Setting and Position/Status If They Were a Special Education Teacher and Chi-Square Findings

Setting	*Position/Status*	*Type of Certification*	*N*	*Chi-Square Finding*
	Undergraduate Student	Categorical	45	X^2 =
		Generic	68	5.469
	Graduate Student	Categorical	12	df = 4
		Generic	29	
				p = .242
General Education or Inclusive	Professor	Categorical	10	
		Generic	16	
	Director of Special Education	Categorical	4	
		Generic	20	
	State Department Special-Education Administrator	Categorical	7	
		Generic	14	
	Undergraduate Student	Categorical	63	X^2 =
		Generic	49	13.796
	Graduate Student	Categorical	14	
		Generic	26	df = 4
Special Education	Professor	Categorical	13	p = .008
		Generic	13	
	Director of Special Education	Categorical	5	
		Generic	19	
	State Department Special-Education Administrator	Categorical	8	
		Generic	14	

TM034647

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC Educational Resources Information Center

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Certification in Mild Disabilities: Perceptions and Preferences of Louisiana Special Education Professionals and Students.

Author(s): Jimmy D. Lindsey, Chhanda Ghose, Regina Patterson, Nicki L. Anzelmo-Skelton, Johan van der Jagt, & Carolyn F. Woods.

~~Corporate Source~~:

Publication Date: November 7, 2002

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: Jimmy D. Lindsey

Printed Name/Position/Title: Jimmy D. Lindsey Professor

Organization/Address: P.O. Box 11241 SU-BR Baton Rouge LA 70813-1241

Telephone: 225-771-3950 FAX: 225-771-5652

E-Mail Address: JLindsey@SUBR.Edu Date: 11/7/2002

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: info@ericfac.piccard.csc.com
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)